

### REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action mailed March 24, 2004, with a shortened statutory period of three months set to expire June 24, 2004. With this amendment, claims 1, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16, 20, 23-26, 28, 30-33, and 35-36 have been amended.

Applicants have amended the specification to refer to "Figures 9A and 9B" instead of "Figure 9". The specification now conforms to the drawings as they were filed.

Applicants have also amended the specification to correct several typographical errors. In several places, the specification incorrectly referred to "physical and special" characteristics of the document. The specification should have referred to "physical and spatial" characteristics of the document such as correctly described on page 17, line 31.

Applicants have amended the claims to describe receiving a request for modified content. The original content of a document is modified in response to each receipt of the request for modified content. Thus, even if the request is the first time such a request is made, the content will be modified.

The content is modified by making selected content invisible without degrading the readability of the document. The document retains its original physical and spatial characteristics even after the content is modified. The document, having its original physical and spatial characteristics, is then displayed.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 20-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,996,011 issued to *Humes* in view of U.S. Patent 6,477,529 issued to *Mousseau*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

*Humes* teaches filtering data received by a computer. The user receives only a portion of the filtered web page. *Humes* does not teach retaining the original physical and spatial characteristics of a document or web page after the content of that page has been modified. Applicants claim modifying the content of a requested document by making some of the content invisible. The document is then displayed, having some of its content rendered invisible, having the document's original physical and spatial

characteristics. According to *Humes*, the original physical and spatial characteristics of the page are not retained because objectionable content is removed from the page.

Applicants also claim modifying the content of a requested document by making some of the content invisible without degrading the readability of the document. The purpose of *Humes* is to degrade readability by replacing objectionable words. In some cases these objectionable words are replaced with dashes and in other cases the words are replaced with the term "FORBIDDEN". Thus, *Humes* teaches away from modifying the contents of a document without degrading the readability of the document.

The Examiner states that *Humes* does not teach compressing the page and uses *Mousseau* to supply this missing feature. *Mousseau* teaches that a user can select portions of a page that will not be displayed on subsequent viewings of the page. No restrictions or modifications are done the first time a document or page is viewed. See column 2, lines 36-39 and column 6, lines 17-19. *Mousseau* teaches the restriction taking place only on subsequent viewings and not on the first viewing. Thus, *Mousseau* does not teach restrictions taking place in response to each request for a page. Because Applicants claim the modification of the document or page taking place in response to each request, *Mousseau* clearly teaches away from Applicants' claims.

The references, neither singly nor in combination, teach the features of Applicants' claims. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,996,011 issued to *Humes* in view of U.S. Patent 6,510,458 issued to *Berstis*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 describes instructions to receive a request to alter original content of a web page and reduce the set of words in the web page, in response to each receipt of the request by making selected content of the original content invisible without degrading readability of the web page where the web page retains its original physical and spatial characteristics after the content is modified in combination with a bus system, a communications adapter, a memory, and a processor unit connected to the bus.


The Examiner states that *Humes* does not teach a bus system and uses *Berstis* to supply this missing feature. The combination of *Humes* and *Berstis*, however, does not

describe, teach, or suggest the features of Applicants' claims. The combination does not describe, teach, or suggest making selected content of the original content invisible without degrading readability of the web page where the web page retains its original physical and spatial characteristics after the content is modified. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Applicants' claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 06.24.04

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa L.B. Yociss  
Reg. No. 36,975  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 367-2001  
Attorney for Applicants